

BS



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/082,772	02/25/2002	Peter Droge	DEBE:008US	4391

7590 01/05/2005

Steven L. Highlander  
FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P.  
Suite 2400  
600 Congress Avenue,  
Austin, TX 78701

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, QUANG

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1636

DATE MAILED: 01/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

10/082,772

Applicant(s)

DROGE ET AL.

Examiner

Quang Nguyen, Ph.D.

Art Unit

1636

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 26 November 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☒ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☒ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 29-51 and 58.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 52-60.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

  
DAVID GUZO  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The new limitation "a modified bacteriophage lambda integrase Int" in the proposed amended claim 29 renders a new scope for the dependent claims 30, 32-39, 41-51 and 58 would necessitate further consideration and a new ground of rejection. Please note that previously presented claims 29-30, 32-39, 41-51 and 58 does not require the use of a modified Int.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the proposed amendment will not be entered for the reason already set forth above.

Applicants' argument related to the rejection under 35 USC 102 (a) as anticipated by Lorbach et al. in the final office action mailed on 9/23/04 has been considered, but it is not found persuasive.

Applicants basically argue that the Lorbach paper is not prior art. Please note that the Lorbach paper has a different inventive entity. Furthermore, Applicants failed to submit a certified copy of the German priority document AND its translated version in English. Accordingly, the Lorbach paper is a prior art.

With respect to Applicants' arguments related to the other prior art rejections in the final office action mailed on 9/23/04, they are not considered because they are all directed to the new proposed limitation "a modified bacteriophage lambda integrase Int" which has not been entered for the reason set forth above.